

#301

FROM THE DESK OF ED FAULKNER

Member: Juniper Acres Community Committee

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft
Public Comment Process


January 15, 2004

Bureau of Land Management Administration,

The accompanying form letter is a direct result of issues and concerns that were brought to my personal attention. The letter is quite straight forward and easy to understand. It is being used as a way to express "*No Support*" for alternative seven's Historic Range Vegetation Management Proposal.

It is my understanding that a significantly large number of concerned citizens are in favor of a "Current Range" approach to vegetation management. The most common pro's and con's are expressed in this letter. The letter is a realistic way to add more objectivity to the planning process. It is the BLM's responsibility to utilize this public input to amend the preferred alternative to support Current Range Vegetation Management.

Thank you,



Edward C. Faulkner

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

302

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name:

Edward C Faulkner

Address, City, Zip:

1750 SE Myrtlewood Ln Prine, 97754

Signed:

Edward C. Faulkner

Date:

1-14-04

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

#303
RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name:

John R. Lickley

Address. City. Zip:

16050 SW Steelhead Rd Terrebonne, Or

Signed:

John R. Lickley

Date:

12/8/03

97760

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

#304
RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name:

Aaron Hohman

Address. City. Zip:

64795 Cline Falls Rd Bend, OR 97701

Signed:

A. H

Date:

12/8/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#305

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B.L.M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Brent Blg

Address, City, Zip: 19313 Kiowa rd Bend OR 97702

Signed: [Signature] Date: 12/8/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

#306
RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: RUD KENTNER

Address: City, Zip: 64220 Shible Rd Bend 97701

Signed: Rud K Date: 12/8/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

#301
RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name:

Shawn Hohman

Address, City, Zip:

19375 Bend 97702

Signed:

Shawn Hohman

Date:

12/8/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

#308

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B.L.M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Daniel L Hall

Address, City, Zip: 64904 Rimrock Dr Bend OR 97701

Signed: Daniel L Hall Date: 8/Dec/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

#309

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: David B. Harris

Address, City, Zip: 1916 NE Wichita Way 97701

Signed: David B. Harris Date: 12/8/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: MARVIN MARKUS

Address. City, Zip: 61863 AVONDALE CR. BEND ORE 97702

Signed: Marvin A Markus Date: 12-8-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

#311

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.


Print name:

RICHARD S. SCHERMANN

Address. City. Zip:

15915 CEDAR LN HAPINE OR 97839

Signed:



Date:

12-7-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

#312

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Justin Goodman

Address, City, Zip: 2769 NE Mesa Ct. #3 Bend Or 97701

Signed: J. Goodman

Date: Dec. 8, 2003

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004 #313

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Matthew Howard

Address, City, Zip: 61114 Deer Valley DR Bend, OR 97702

Signed: Matthew Howard Date: 12-8-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

#314

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Terry Wallace

Address, City, Zip: 19271 Shoshone

Signed: J. J. Wallace Date: 12/08/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#315

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: SCOTT WHITE

Address, City, Zip: 8415 S.W. Lower Ridge Rd. CLM. OR 97760

Signed: [Signature] Date: 1-10-04

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#316

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Joe Kodgers

Address, City, Zip: P.O. Box 7938 Bend, OR 97708

Signed: Joe Kodgers Date: 1/10/04

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Dylan Owens

Address, City, Zip: 2262 wellman dr 97701

Signed: Dylan Owens

Date: 1-10-04

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#318

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Don Christofferson

Address, City, Zip: 7128 Jane Hle Ct S.E. Salem Or 97301

Signed: Don Christofferson Date: 12-9-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#319

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: David Byrkh
Address. City. Zip: 20772 Liberty In. Bud OR
Signed: David Byrkh Date: 12-08-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#320

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: KEVIN TODD

Address, City, Zip: 2003 NE RED ROCK LN BEND 97701

Signed: [Signature] Date: 12-09-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#321

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: MATTHEW KERCHER

Address. City. Zip: 1598 WELLS ACRES RD BEND 97701

Signed: [Signature] Date: 12-8-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#332

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future. —
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.. 's efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: DANNA L LUCKLEY

Address. City, Zip: 16050 SW STEELHEAD RD PRINEVILLE 97760

Signed: Danna Luckley Date: 12/8/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#323

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name:

Robert H Chamberlain

Address, City, Zip:

2460 NW 101ST ST. Redmond OR 97756

Signed:

Robert H Chamberlain

Date:

1-10-04

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

#324

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name:

Cindy Chamberlin

Address, City, Zip:

2460 NW 10th St Redmond 97756

Signed:

Cindy Chamberlin

Date:

1-9-04

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

#325

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Martin Deek

Address, City, Zip: 814 NE 9th Bend, OR

Signed: Martin Deek Date: 1-10-4

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

#326

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.


Print name:

Steve Wilkinson

Address, City, Zip:

425 SW Stanton Rd, Forest Grove

Signed:



Date:

12903

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

#329

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Thomas A Lillis

Address. City. Zip: 19960 Cedar Ln Bend Ore 97701

Signed: Thomas A Lillis Date: 12-9-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#328

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: BRAD CONN

Address. City. Zip: 2911 S.W. Volcano Circle Redmond, OR 97756

Signed: Brad Conn Date: 12-9-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

#329

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Gene Wright

Address, City, Zip: 1640 NW 77th Redmond, Ore 97756

Signed: Gene Wright

Date: 12/08/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#330

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Steve Radd

Address, City, Zip: 2835 Alhambra Dr. Belmont, CA 94002

Signed: Steve Radd Date: 1/12/04

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#331

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Brett Mills

Address, City, Zip: 1440 NW 87th Ct Redmond OR 97756

Signed: [Signature] Date: 1/10/04

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#332

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Darrin Watson

Address, City, Zip: 292 NE 8th St Prineville 97754

Signed: Darrin J. Watson Date: 1-10-04

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#333

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Darrell Lewis

Address, City, Zip: 1735 SE Melrose DR Prineville OR

Signed: Darrell Lewis

Date: 1-10-04

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#334

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Tim Lewis

Address, City, Zip: 3838 McKay Prineville

Signed: Tim Lewis

Date: 1-10-04

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#335

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Shane McBrady

Address, City, Zip: Box 214 Terrebonne, OR 97760

Signed: Shane McBrady Date: 1-10-04

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#336

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name:

Ted Morris

Address, City, Zip:

3072 NE Waverly Ct. Bend, OR 97701

Signed:

Ted Morris

Date:

12-10-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#331

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft,
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Richard Ross

Address, City, Zip: 22410 Calgary DR Bend OR 97702

Signed: Richard Ross Date: 12-10-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#338

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: GERALD BARLUP

Address, City, Zip: 21875 NEIGHBORS DRIVE BEND, OREGON 97702

Signed: J. Barlup, Jr. Date: 12/10/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#339

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Dennis Harvey

Address, City, Zip: 1768 Forest Ridge Ave

Signed: [Signature] Date: 12-10-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#340

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: THOMAS J. STREET

Address, City, Zip: 2548 NE 2ND ST. BEND, OR 97701

Signed: [Signature] Date: 1-7-04

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#341

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use. and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.


Print name:

DEREK SAUCEDO

Address, City, Zip:

PO BOX 1696 97756

Signed:



Date:

12/20/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Chad Kost

Address, City, Zip: 501 5th St Metolius Or, 97741

Signed: Chad Kost

Date: 12/26/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

#343

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Getu Saucedo

Address, City, Zip: Vancouver wa 98683

Signed: Getu Saucedo Date: 12/26/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#344

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Jason Peters

Address, City, Zip: 2536 SW Volcano Ave Redmond 97756

Signed: [Signature] Date: 12-23-03

RECEIVED

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#345

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name:

Ron Eranson

Address, City, Zip:

2350 Fissure Ln N Redmond, OR 97756

Signed:

[Signature]

Date: 1-2-04

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#346

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name:

Tam Gough

Address, City, Zip:

4336 SW Tammy Armour Ct.

Signed:

Jim Dyer

Date:

1 9 04

Redmond
OR
97756

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#341

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Bryant Wise

Address, City, Zip: 3533 S.W. 32nd St. Redmond 97756

Signed: Bryant Wise Date: 1-12-04

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#348

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M., is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Adam Fiddler

Address, City, Zip: 60621 Ridge Hts Bend OR

Signed: Adam Fiddler Date: 12-10-03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#349

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M.. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support:

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: KIRK T. CAMBRA

Address, City, Zip: 1918 NE WITCHITA WAY 97701

Signed: Kirk T. Cambra Date: 12/10/03

Bureau of Land Management
ATT: Teal Purrington
3050 NE 3rd St.
Prineville, Oregon 97754

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2004

BLM PRINEVILLE
DISTRICT

#350

RE: Upper Deschutes Resource Management Draft.
Public Comment Process

As a concerned Central Oregon resident I would like to be on record as supportive of 'Current Range Vegetation Management'. The preferred alternative B.L.M. is proposing utilizes a newly formulated technique called 'Historic Range'. I support 'Current Range' over 'Historic Range' for several reasons.

1. Current range is the B.L.M.'s present method of vegetation management.
 - a. It is the best approach because of it's built in flexibility.
 - b. Current range isn't restricted like historic range to a concept of trying to recreate the uncertainties of the past.
 - c. The concept of recreating vegetation conditions that existed 150 years ago and before is impossible and isn't very beneficial to the community at large.
 - d. Current range is the most compatible and consistent with other current land-use activities like agriculture, multiple use and recreation.
 - e. Current range works the best with our current and future vegetative conditions.
 - f. Current range has the best chance of creating a healthy and diversified ecosystem that prioritizes our current needs and vegetative concerns.
 - g. The B. L. M. is managing public lands within a federally designated reclamation project area. The land within this reclamation area is mostly privately owned. This project area is meant for human development and occupancy. That is another key reason I support current range, it accommodates people and their actions the best. It works better under change, the types of changes that will occur now and in the future.
2. Historic range vegetation management is a new and uncertain concept I do not support.
 - a. I do not support the B.L.M.'s efforts to re-create the vegetation uncertainties of the past.
 - b. How do I know if historic range is the best choice when it's never been used before?
 - c. Historic range will be more expensive to implement and more law enforcement will be necessary.
 - d. Those greater expenses cannot be justified by results that are unclear and uncertain.
 - e. Historic range reduces public access, has built-in conflicts with multiple use, and de-emphasizes agricultural use.

Please amend the preferred alternative to support;

'Current Range Vegetation Management'.

Print name: Tom Schlossmacher

Address, City, Zip: 65305 Saddle dr Bend Or 97701

Signed: [Signature] Date: 12/11/03